

Dear Clerk of Court re: 13-CV-145 (09-CR-043)

I mailed on January 27, 2014, my motion to file an overleng the reply. As of February 7, 2014 I have received no order granting my motion. LCUR 7.2 requires such motion be filed I day before the reply is due, but of an abundance of caution I can providing you a copy of that motion I mailed on January 27, 2014 in case you did not necesive my motion. My Reply brief is due on February 10, 2014.

RECEIVED

FEB 1 3 2014

Phil Lombardi, Clerk U.S. DISTRICT COURT Thank You Sindsey K Springs 2/7/14

Declaration of Mailing

I declare under penalty of perjury that I deposited the above letter and a courtesy copy of my January 27, 2014 Motur to File overlength brief in the U.S. Mailbox located in FSL LaTura on February 7, 2014

> Lindsey & Springer declarat

In the United States District Court For The Northern District of Oklahoma

	Lindsey Kent Springer
	Petitioner/mount
	United States of America (Formerly 09-cR-043)
	United States of America (tormerly 09-cR-043)
	Respondent
	Motion For Leave To File
	overlength Reply
	Lindsey Kent Springer ("Petitioner") moves this
• •	court For Leave to file an overlength reply to Respond-
	ents Preliminary Response
	Respondent's Preliminary Respose is 10 pages accomp-
	aniel by a 53 page attachment, Doc. 518. This Court's
	order dated march 15, 2013 directed attention to local
	rules regarding 25 page unitations. Doc 478, pg 3,
	Atthough the procedure seems confusing to Petitioner,
**************************************	the courts recent order did assist Petiturer in reduc-
•	ing his reply dramatically.
	What causes the need to exceed the page limitation
	is where, on the one hand Respondent arques an issue
	was raised in the district court, or in the Appellate
	court, but then also asserts by use of the term
	"yes" or "no" whether the issue they arque was so

all 53 attachment pages. Where Respondent arques an issue could have been raised, after either claiming the issue was raised, ur on an issue Petitioner alleged could not have been raised previously, requires petitioner to identify why the ground could not have been raised, urin most issues, how Respondent Fails to allege any issue in any ground was ever resolved either in the district court or on direct appeal. "When an issue should have been naised on direct appeal, the defendant ordinarily can raise the issue in a \$2255 motion only if the defendant raised it on direct appeal but the appellate court Failed to address t. "U.S. v. Goodlett, 403 Fed Appx. 311, 313 Cloth Cv. 2010) (un published); citing U.S. v. Coop, 997 F. 22 1312, 1318 and (n.w) (10th cur. 1993). See also Kaufman v. U.S. 394 U.S 217, 227 (N.8) (1969). The conflicting arguments cause Petitioner to spend Reply length refuting each, Prior to this Court's recent order Petitioner had accumilated approximately a 200 page Reply. After this courts order, if Petitioner understands it correctly, Petitioner's Reply is 60 pages and only addresses the issues raised by Respondent in his Preliminary Response. In order to show why an issue could not have been naised, for instance, does require some discussion of the merits but not the level that Step Two will require.

and the second of	Petituner requests this Court issue an order		
and the second second	granting leave to file his rep		
	60 pages,		
	· Conclusion		
,	Petitioner respectfully requests this court issue		
	an order allowing Petitioner's Reply include 60 page		
	_	espectfully Submitted	
		Lundsey K Dringer eg # 02580-063	
	1,27,14 dated R.	eq # 012580 063 deral Satellite Low Lating	
The same of the same transfer to the same same same same same same same sam		0, Box 6000	
and the second s	Ax	thony, New Mexico 88021	
	Certificate of Service I hereby Cortify that on January 27, 2014, I mailed by First Class mail the above Motion to the Clerkof Court, 333 West Fourth St. Tulsa, Oktahoma 74103!		
	I Further Certify that all F	Parties are negistered ECF	
	users and shall receive service through the ECF Systen!		
	Dany C. Williams Sr.		
	Charles A O'Reilly		
	Jeffrey Gallard Lindseyth Epsengy		
n de la companya de l			
deleteration and high things are purposed to \$ 1.00 to a security and	Serv	er/ ' ' '	
	Declaration of Mailing I declare under penalty of perjury that on Janu- ary 27, 2014, I deposited the above motion in the U.S. Mailbox located inside FSL. Latina,		
anguage of the state of the sta			

	A	ndseyt prings	
		laraki / /	

